

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the informal phone interview. Several aspects of the invention were discussed (e.g., controlling a light source), but no agreement was reached.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 20-27, 29-47, 51, 52, 54, 55, 63-70, 73 and 75 under 35 USC 102 and claims 4-19, 28, 48-50, 53, 56-61, 71, 72 and 74 under 35 USC 103. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 32, 52, 56, 65, 66 and 75 have been amended. Claim 32, in particular, was amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 33. Claims 76 and 77 have been added. Claims 2 and 33 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 3-32, 34-77 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 20-27, 29-47, 51, 52, 54, 55, 63-70, 73 and 75 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *An et al* (6,494,593).

Claim 4-19, 28, 48-50, 53, 56-61, 71, 72 and 74 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *An et al* (6,494,593).

In brief, the present invention gives users the ability to change the color or pattern of a housing (the color of the housing is controllable). By colorizing or patternizing the housing, users can break free from neutral passive colors and patterns that have dominated conventional housings for so long (e.g., gray or black housings). No such feature is taught or described in *An*.

In contrast to *An*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a controllable light emitting device disposed inside the illuminable housing, the light emitting device being configured to produce an adjustable light effect for colorizing or patternizing the illuminable housing..." In *An*, the light does not change, nor is it controllable. In fact, it appears to rely on the constant output from the light emitting part 21 of the LCD unit 30. Furthermore, it does not

colorize or patternize the case 200. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *An*, claim 32 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...the light source being dedicated to illuminating the light passing wall..." In *An*, the light emitting part 21 is not dedicated to illuminating the logo 800, but rather to providing illumination to the LCD unit 30. The light used for the logo 800 is secondary light. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *An*, claim 52 (and its dependents), specifically requires, "...the light arrangement being configured to illuminate a substantial portion of the housing so as to significantly alter the ornamental appearance of the housing." By substantial and significant, it is meant that the area of illumination is larger enough to effect the overall appearance of the device. That is, the illumination constitutes a significant % area of the entire housing. The mark or logo 800 disclosed in *An* is simply too small. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *An*, claim 56 (and its dependents), specifically requires, "...a controllable light emitting device enclosed by the housing, the light emitting device being configured to produce an adjustable light effect for colorizing or patternizing the illuminable portion..." and claim 65 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a controllable light arrangement enclosed by the housing, the light arrangement being configured to produce an adjustable light effect for colorizing or patternizing the illuminable portion." As mentioned above, the light emitting part 21 in *An* does not change, nor is it controllable. Furthermore, it does not colorize or patternize the case 200. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *An*, claim 66 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a control means for varying a characteristic or attribute of the light generated by the light source..." *An* is completely silent to controlling light. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to *An*, claim 75 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a user controlled light source disposed inside the housing and capable of colorizing or patternizing the

surface of the housing in order to effect the ornamental appearance of the electronic device.” The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above (see claim 1).

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 3, 20-27, 29-31, 34-47, 51, 54, 55, 63-64, 67-70 and 73 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons as above, it should be noted that they offer additional language that is unsupported by the art. For example, with regards to the 102 rejections, claim 25 specifically requires “...a display that is distinctly separate from the light emitting device ...” claim 34 specifically requires, “...the light source is not a display...” and claim 38 specifically requires, “...a light source and a display...” In *An*, the display is the source of light for the logo and thus it is not a distinctly separate component as required by the claims. Furthermore, *An* is completely silent to a light source and a display. Accordingly, the rejections are unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

With regards to the 103 rejections, claim 4 specifically requires, “...the light source includes at least one light emitting diode...” and claim 9 specifically requires, “the light emitting diodes cooperate to produce a light effect having plurality of colors...” As should be appreciated, LEDs offer many advantages over other light sources. LEDs are relatively small, energy efficient, long lasting, run relatively cool and are low in cost. Furthermore, they come in various colors. In one particular arrangement, red green and blue LEDs are used in order to produce a light effect with varying coloration, i.e., the LEDs are capable of generating colors in the color spectrum via color mixing. As such, they may be used in a controlled manner to colorize or patternize a housing. Accordingly, the rejections are unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

C. Morgan Thomas, Reg. #32,947

for Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300